

$\frac{L}{11028.1886 Bq}$

COMMERCIAL UNION
BETWEEN
CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES.

An Address delivered before the Canadian Club of New York

BY
HON. B. BUTTERWORTH, M. C.

Mr. President and Gentlemen of the Canadian Club of New York:

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I have first to thank you for the kind courtesy that calls me before you.

It is my purpose to discuss the merits of full and complete reciprocity of trade and commerce,—commercial union, if you please, between the United States and the Dominion of Canada. Import and export duties are levied for two purposes.

First.—To collect revenue to defray the expenses and to pay the debts of the government.

Second.—To encourage, foster, and protect domestic industry.

The protective system, as it is called, has for its object to do away with the inequalities which obtain between competitors in the several industries in this country and those of the old world engaged in the same field of employment.

It was not intended as an agency for the mere increase of profits, the question for Congress to consider not being simply the magnitude of profits resulting from manufactures, but whether we should be able without the protective duty levied on articles of commerce produced in the old world, to engage successfully in manufactures at all; the established plants of the older countries, with the rare skill acquired during the centuries gone, the abundance of cheap labor, enabling European manufacturers to lay down goods at our doors cheaper than we could possibly produce them. Hence money invested in a shop, mill or factory must in the nature of things, in the presence of such competition, be a dead loss.

This did not apply with such force to the agriculturist who can compete with the world in the growth of agricultural products. Of course the protective tariff raised the price of all the articles upon which this duty was imposed, and the cost of most of the articles the farmer used except such as he produced himself was enhanced. He found his compensation under the protective system in this, that in the building up of our industries under its influence great cities and towns, centres of large industrial population, grew up and provided a market for the product of the farms. So that what the farmer lost in the increased price of the articles he purchased, he more than made up by the increased amount he received for the supplies he was enabled to sell to those employed in the industries which owed their existence to the protective system. As a tub to the agricultural whale a tariff was levied upon farm produce also.

The European manufacturer and merchant cannot land a plow, a trace-chain, a knife or hoe upon our soil without paying a large tax to our government for the privilege. Nor could the merchant sell us a yard of cloth or silk, or a quinine pill, until he had paid the duty levied by Congress. Of

5:54

1914.52

Penn. Burr. Stat.

course all this is paid at last by the consumer, who finds his compensation for the alleged burden in the prosperity of his country brought about in the manner I have mentioned. The tariff is a tax levied arbitrarily by Congress—there is but one party to it. It is a matter with which the nation adopting the system has to do.

It should and does ostensibly deal with unequal conditions in the field of competition, its mission being to equalize them. It follows logically, and as a common-sense proposition, that when the conditions are equal, so-called protection is disguised robbery, legalized filching from one citizen to enrich another.

Reciprocity of trade involves an agreement between two nations, according to the terms of which, trade and commerce are to be carried on between the citizens of the two contracting nations.

What is proposed in the present instance, and the merits of which I propose to discuss, is full and complete reciprocal trade and commerce between the United States and Canada, by the terms of which, for all purposes of trade, barter and exchange, the two countries shall be as one; the arrangement having nothing to do with government matters or political conditions, there being no necessary connection or relation between the political institutions of a country and its trade and commerce. We seek by this arrangement to remove all the custom-houses along our Canadian frontier, to withdraw the line of pickets that keep watch and ward on both sides along 3,000 miles of our northern boundary to see to it that the American farmer does not sell his neighbor across the line some early potatoes or early corn without going to the custom-house, paying a large part of the value of the produce for the privilege, and compelling the Canadian to submit to the same extortion before he can sell to his friend who supplied him with the early corn and potatoes a later variety of the same articles, that we—as the

5:17

19.4.52

Don. Burr. Stat.

inhabitants of what is for all purposes of trade a common country, being in race, religion, ancestry and tradition one people, differing only in our political institutions—shall throw down the barriers that now block every highway of business prosperity and progress, and open all the courses and channels of trade between the Gulf of Mexico and the Northern boundary of the Dominion of Canada—that the farmers, manufacturers and merchants shall seek out markets unhampered and unrestricted in every part of this vast field of development, and thereby settle at once and in a manner worthy of our race and civilization the petty squabbles, now more than a century old, about the fisheries. He who appeals to the protective system as between competitors in Canada and in the United States asks monopoly, not equality. He seeks an unjust advantage, not an equal opportunity.

As against the old world, both Americans and Canadians may invoke the protective system ; but as between Canadians and Americans it has no proper place, unless to authorize extortion in the interest of the monopolists is the proper mission of legislative effort.

There is not a condition, there is not a worthy interest involved in the proposition that does not cry out against the present system and in favor of the fullest reciprocal trade.

Careful investigation will disclose that the growth of our industries and their values is in large measure the result of the patent system which has founded and multiplied industries almost beyond computation. It is well to be sure as to the actual sources of our prosperity. I have not time to discuss this factor of the problem more at length, but must proceed to the main question, the nature of which I have endeavored to explain.

The adoption of the system proposed would involve an assimilation of tariff rates and internal revenue taxes, and

possibly an arrangement for pooling receipts from customs, and a division on some equitable basis—all of which, as has been fully demonstrated, present no serious difficulty or embarrassing problem.

The details of the arrangement I do not propose now to discuss. It is enough to say that the policy being decided upon, the execution is easy.

The time and condition of the two countries force this question upon public attention.

It is said that unsettled public questions have no pity for the repose of nations. The truth of that saying is fitly illustrated by the presence with us for a century of an unsettled question between the United States and Canada touching the fisheries. It stands, and has stood since the treaty of Paris, a constant and threatening menace to the peace and repose of both nations. It has been a barrier in the highway of our trade and commerce. It relates to a single industry, and the effort has been made repeatedly to settle it without reference to other interests with which it is in the nature of things inseparably intertwined. As suggested, the question is not new, nor does it now for the first time force itself forward and challenge the thoughtful consideration of both nations. It relates to the rights and obligations of the fishermen of the two countries to catch fish in certain localities and to sell them in certain markets. Relating solely to the privileges of a few thousand fishermen engaged in a single avocation, it draws into the vortex of the controversy all other interests pertaining to trade and commerce between the two nations. Canada and the United States are contiguous parts of the same territory. They both formed a part of the Dominion of Great Britain. The colonists of the now United States bore their share of the burdens and endured equal hardships and fought to establish the sovereignty of the British flag in what now constitutes the Dominion of Canada. The history of the Do-

minion is much the same as that of the United States, so far as her political relation to the mother country is concerned. She has run, and is running the same course ; the only difference being that England—wisely and justly, under the influence of a riper and more enlightened civilization, under the inspiration of a broader statesmanship, in which the sword plays a less conspicuous part than formerly—accords to Canada a prompt redress for every grievance, recognizing the demands of the situation and the inexorable logic of events. The careful student of history will discover that the demands of the Canadian provinces upon the mother country for larger powers and wider jurisdiction in the management of affairs that appertain and relate solely to the rights and privileges of the citizens of the several provinces have been of a character which pass quite beyond what would have satisfied the American colonist originally. Canada, while entertaining and cherishing both respect and affection for the mother country, has learned in the school of experience her needs, and has in a manner which suggested something more than firmness petitioned for relief which has at first or last been accorded. The restrictions thrown around and the burdens imposed upon the trade, commerce and manufactures of the colonies by the mother country were intolerable. No people fit to be free, and being at all worthy of their English ancestry, would submit. They did not submit. Whether they and the world are gainers by their course results must attest.

It is exceedingly interesting to note how like suppliants the colonists approached the mother country and sued for relief against laws and administration confessedly oppressive and intolerable, and then observe the manner in which our cousins on the North stand up and demand what their experience has taught them properly belonged to a free and enlightened people in the matter of self-government. Eng-

land long since decided that free-trade was best for her interest, but not until she became, under a different system, the workshop of the world and mistress of the seas. Her restrictions upon the trade of her American colonies had little of the flavor of free-trade about them, so far as the colonists themselves were concerned. Virginia was required to ship her tobacco to England and only in English vessels. England interposed her authority to paralyze every manufacturing industry in the country. That condition of things could not last, and we were finally compelled to set up for ourselves, but not until we had helped to establish the sovereignty of the British flag over the country north of us. In 1763 England sent to Canada the first Governor-General. During the latter part of the eighteenth century the legislative bodies of Canada had little power; but during the last fifty years the provinces have not been slow to demand such enlargement of the powers of the home government as the necessities of the people required, and England has acceded, though not always with good grace, until the destiny of Canada, by common consent, is practically confided to Canadians. If her past is England's, her future is her own. The growth of Canada in the direction of substantial independence in the matter of managing her own affairs has in no wise disturbed the filial regard, if I may use that expression, which naturally and inevitably grows out of the relations which Canadians sustain to the people of England. I say the people of England, not the English government. I make the distinction because there is a broad difference between an affectionate regard for the people of a nation and unquestioned loyalty to the governmental policy which that nation may see fit to adopt. I was devotedly attached to my father, loved and honored him. I might not have enthused greatly over his ideas of the discipline he would have regarded as necessary in my household after I had a home, roof and family of my own.

Canadians, for the best of reasons, must cherish the deepest and sincerest affection for their English ancestors. So do we all. But that does not involve in large degree a surrender of that independence of character and action which is inseparable from decent, worthy manhood, as that quality asserts itself in the concerns of the individual or the affairs of the State.

I am addressing Canadians whose loyalty to their country and institutions cannot be called in question. I only refer to the history of the course of the United States and Canada toward their mother country to show that what has been in the past, and what in the future will be sought is the freedom, prosperity and happiness of the citizens of each nation; that they have in fact been treading the same paths to attain the same end. Canada remains loyal to England, very naturally and very properly, because the latter has accorded to her those rights and privileges, a denial of which to her children of the republic when they were colonists drove them into emulating the example of their English ancestors, namely, to sue for their rights; if need be, fight for them.

The controversy about the fisheries is our quarrel. It is for us to settle and to adjust it in consonance with enlightened principles and a decent and just regard for the rights, duties, obligations and interests of all the citizens of both nations. Such a settlement has hitherto been impossible because negotiations proceeded from the stand-point of English ideas of what economic principle should govern in the establishment of the trade and commerce between the people most deeply interested. A permanent and lasting solution of the question was and must continue to remain impossible, so long as English as contradistinguished from Canadian interests, are a matter of first consideration. No full and final adjustment having reference to the prosperity and lasting peace of the two countries can be had except

the negotiations proceed from the stand-point of the immediate interests to be affected thereby, and they are essentially the interests of the provinces of Canada and of the United States. And beyond that, the adjustment must not proceed upon the idea or theory that the fishing interests are to be segregated and treated as if they stood apart and alone, free and disassociated from other interests, industries and avocations. Any discussion or settlement that proceeds upon any basis except that of securing the greatest good to the greatest number, is partial and unjust, as resting upon a false premise. The controversy about the fisheries grew up in this way. Prior to the American Revolution the inhabitants of the English dependencies in America enjoyed a common fishing ground in the neighborhood of Nova Scotia, Newfoundland, and in the bays and gulfs in that locality. The treaty of 1783, which terminated the war of the Revolution, in a vague way defined the rights and privileges of the people of the United States in the fisheries. Controversies innumerable were constantly growing out of alleged trespasses by one party or the other, and armed cruisers were maintained on the ground to keep the peace and protect the rights of the citizens of the nation whose flag the cruiser floated at the mast-head.

The treaty of Ghent, which witnessed the end of the war of 1814—signed in December, 1814—was silent on the subject of the fisheries. Subsequently, England was disposed to treat that omission as a surrender by the United States of substantial rights in the fishing grounds theretofore enjoyed by the Americans. This was not allowed by the United States and so the dispute went on, threatening from time to time to culminate in war. In 1851 the relations of the two countries were strained to the last degree—I speak of England and the United States, Canada being treated as the cause of the quarrel rather than as being a party to it. Canada was the little boy whose big brother had stepped

on him. Statesmen viewing this question from only two proper stand-points of observation and negotiation, to wit, the United States and Canada maintained that the controversy involved something beyond the interest of the respective parties in the fisheries. The question swept the whole range of trade and commerce between Canada and the United States, and it was maintained by the statesmen of that day that the only adjustment which ought to commend itself to the several governments was one which placed our international trade on a different footing—that free reciprocal trade between Canada and the United States was the true solution of the difficulty. This could only be effected by treaty with England. Canada stood by and waited, and took what was sent, but grumbled the while. Such favor did the idea of reciprocity of trade find that in 1848 the House of Representatives passed a bill which had for its object the establishment of that relation. John Quincy Adams was a member of that House. Robert C. Winthrop and Abraham Lincoln were also members of that House. The attitude of the Whig party toward reciprocity may be inferred from the fact that they had a majority of ten in the House which passed the bill I have mentioned. The Senate was Democratic. The bill failed to become a law only because there was not time before adjournment for its consideration by the Senate. Wm. H. Seward was then Senator from New York. Daniel Webster was Secretary of State, Millard Fillmore was President. It had come to be recognized that the only possible settlement of the controversy in regard to the fisheries, which could be just and lasting, and which would tend to promote the prosperity of the two parties whose interests were immediately and most affected, was the removal of the hampering restriction upon commerce and the enlargement of the trade relations between the United States and Canada.

Mr. Seward, in closing his speech on the subject of the fisheries, said:

"What the colonies require is some modification of commercial relations which may affect the revenue. That is a subject proper to be acted upon by Congress. Let us no longer excite ourselves and agitate the country with unavailing debates, but let us address ourselves to the relief of the fishermen and the improvement of our commerce. There is only one way that Congress can act, and that is by reciprocal legislation with the British Parliament or the British colonies."

And he asks the question whether or not there cannot be some measure adopted of reciprocal legislation to adjust these difficulties and enlarge the rights of our fishermen consistently with all the other interests of the United States.

The wisdom of those who adopted that view has been attested by time and experience. Partial reciprocity came in 1854, and only failed in its mission because it was partial, unequal, and in a measure unjust. It is believed that Canada had the advantage in that arrangement. However, the treaty which secured a measure of reciprocal trade only proved the adequacy of the remedy if properly applied.

In furtherance of this same policy, President Grant, in 1874, negotiated a treaty establishing in part substantially what is now proposed. The propositions embraced in that treaty, which was negotiated by President Grant and Secretary Fish on the one side, and Sir Edward Thornton and the Hon. George Brown, commissioners for the provinces and Great Britain, on the other, embraced the following propositions, which I quote from a report semi-officially submitted by Mr. Brown to the Canadian Senate:

"The draft treaty embraces ten propositions: 1. The concession to the United States of our fisheries for twenty-one years, and the abandonment of the Washington treaty

arbitration. 2. The admission, duty free, into both countries, of certain natural products therein named. 3. The admission, duty free, of certain manufactured articles therein named. 4. The enlargement of our Welland and St. Lawrence canals. 5. The construction of the Caughnawaga and Whitehall canals. 6. The throwing open to each other, reciprocally by both countries, the coasting-trade of the great inland lakes, and of the St. Lawrence river. 7. The concession to each other on equal terms of the use of the Canadian, New York and Michigan canals. 8. The reciprocal admission of vessels built in either country to all the advantages of registry in the other. 9. The formation of a joint commission to secure the efficient lighting of the great inland waters common to both countries. 10. The formation of a joint commission to promote the protection and propagation of fish on the great inland waters common to both countries." [The proposed Caughnawaga canal was intended to connect the St. Lawrence river at Montreal with the northern end of Lake Champlain. The Whitehall canal was intended to connect the Hudson river at Troy with Lake Champlain at Whitehall.]

It will be observed by reference to the list of articles covered by this treaty that it is free from one of the objections suggested with reference to the reciprocity treaty of 1854, in that it admits into the Canadian markets the products of our factories and shops, which the treaty of 1854 did not. The list covered by the treaty is as follows: Agricultural implements, of all kinds; axles, of all kinds; boots and shoes, of leather; boot and shoemaking machines; buffalo robes, dressed and trimmed; cotton grain bags; cotton denims; cotton jeans, unbleached; cotton drillings, unbleached; cotton plaids; cotton ticking; cottonacks, unbleached; cabinet ware or furniture, or parts thereof; carriages, carts, wagons, and other wheeled vehicles or sleighs, or parts thereof; fire-engines, or parts thereof; felt cover-

ing for boilers; gutta-percha belting and tubing; iron—bar, hoop, pig, puddled, rod, sheet or scrap; iron nails, spikes, bolts, tacks, braids, or springs, iron-castings; India-rubber belting and tubing; locomotives for railways, or parts thereof; lead, sheet or pig; leather, sole or upper; leather, harness or saddlery; mill or factory or steamboat fixed engines and machines, or parts thereof; manufactures of marble, stone, slate, or granite; manufactures of wood solely, or of wood nailed, bound, hinged, or locked with metal materials; mangles, washing machines, wringing machines, drying machines, or parts thereof; printing paper for newspapers; paper-making machines, or parts thereof; printing type, presses and folders, paper cutters, ruling machines, page-numbering machines, and stereotyping and electrotyping apparatus, or parts thereof; refrigerators, or parts thereof; railroad cars, carriages and trucks, or parts thereof; satinetts of wool and cotton; steam-engines, or parts thereof; steel, wrought or cast, and steel-plates and rails; tin tubes and piping; tweeds, of wool solely; water-wheel machines and apparatus, or parts thereof.

It will be observed that the treaty embraced articles of common daily use among the people and such as affect the prosecution of leading industries. They also relate specially to the protection of branches of industry engaged in by the citizens of both countries, and to articles in which considerable traffic between the two may be reasonably expected.

Commenting upon the wisdom of this treaty, one of the leading statesmen of Canada, the Hon. George Brown, who, as stated, was one of the commissioners on the part of Great Britain, made use of the following language, which I will adopt, as it presents the case with clearness and candor, and, as I think, impartially, and suggests the advantages which are to inure in case of a reciprocal arrangement, which not only includes all that was covered by the

treaty of 1854, and proposed in the negotiations of 1874, but removes every commercial barrier that now exists along the line which separates the two nations.

Speaking of the ten propositions, Mr. Brown said : "The first, second and seventh of them go naturally together, and they need no comment. They embrace simply the conditions of the old treaty of 1854, which operated so favorably for us, and so much more favorably for the United States. I will leave it for the present and return to it again. The fourth proposition—for the enlargement of our existing canals—is one eminently for the advantage of the United States, and involves a very large expenditure on our part. It is impossible to estimate the enormous annual gains that must result to the farmers of the Western States, when vessels of 1,000 and 1,200 tons shall be able to load in the upper lake ports and sail direct to Liverpool—free from transshipment expenses, brokers' commissions, way-harbor dues, and ocean port-charges, and return direct to the prairies with hardy emigrants and cargoes of European merchandise. Canada, no doubt, would have her share of benefit from all this—but it could not be compared for a moment with that of the great Northwestern and some of the Middle States. The fifth proposition for the construction of the Caughnawaga canal would be also an immense boon to the United States. It would open up to the dense manufacturing population of New England for the first time, a direct water communication of their own with the great West; it would enable them to load ships of 1,000 tons at their Lake Champlain ports with merchandise for the prairie States, and bring them back freighted with farm produce; and when the Whitehall canal should be enlarged to Troy, and the improvements of the upper Hudson completed to deep water, where in the wide world could be found so grand a system of internal water navigations that, stretching as it then would, in one con-

tinuous ship channel from New York on the Atlantic to the west end of Lake Superior, possibly ere long to the eastern base of the Rocky Mountains.

"Canada, too, would have her share of profit in all this. Her great lumber interests on the Ottawa and its branches would find full advantage from it, and the enterprising farmers of the midland and Eastern counties of Ontario would have the New England market, with its three and a half millions of manufacturing population, open to their traffic. The sixth proposition is the concession to each other of the inland coasting-trade, and nothing could be done more sensible or more profitable to both parties. Our season of navigation on the lakes is short—the pressure for vessels in particular trades at special times is very great on both sides of the lakes, and freights advance to unreasonable rates. Cheap transportation is a foremost question in this Western industrial world, and what can be conceived more absurd than to see, as is often seen, large quantities of produce lying unshipped for want of vessels, because foreign bottoms cannot take freight from one port to another in the same country? What the United States could fear from the competition of our limited marine with the 5,576 vessels of all kinds and an aggregate tonnage of 788,000 tons, it is difficult to imagine. The eighth proposition—for the reciprocal admission of vessels built in either country to registry in the other—is generally regarded as highly advantageous to this country, and no doubt such is the fact. But I confess I cannot see why it ought not to be regarded as infinitely more advantageous to the United States. During the civil war the merchant vessels of the Republic were sold in large numbers to foreign owners, and acquired foreign registers, and notwithstanding that ship-building had almost disappeared from the United States in consequence of an extreme protectionist policy, the law absolutely forbade their being brought back or vessels of

foreign build being purchased in their room. The consequence is that, at this moment, nearly the entire passenger traffic of the Atlantic is in the hands of foreigners—a vast portion of the freight of merchandise from and to foreign countries is also in the hands of foreigners—and only two months ago we had the startling statement made officially by Mr. Bristow, the very able Secretary of the United States Treasury, that no less a sum than \$100,000,000 is paid annually by the people of the United States to foreign ship-owners for freights and fares. Now, a large portion of these ships, which the people of the United States require so urgently, can be as well built in St. John and Halifax and Quebec, and at less cost than in any other country. Why, then, deprive the American citizens of the privilege of buying them from us and sailing them as their own? We are told that American shipbuilding is reviving; but were it to revive with all the rapidity the most sanguine could desire, it could not keep pace with the wear and tear of the present reduced marine and the annually increasing demands, much less begin to supply the *vacuum* created since the war. The ninth and tenth proposals are for the appointment of joint commissions for the care of the lighthouses and the fisheries of the inland waters common to both countries; but as to these there is no difference of opinion, and no doubt of the great mutual advantage that might flow from the proposed concerted action in regard to them."

This treaty did not fail by reason of its not finding favor with the Senate. It was not transmitted to that body till the 17th of June, 1874, and so near adjournment that there was not time for its consideration. The propositions as stated show how broad and sweeping the contemplated arrangement was to have been. Had that treaty been completed it would have been the most brilliant achievement of President Grant's administration, and before this the last barrier that intercepts the natural and healthful flow of

trade between Canada and the United States would have been removed. The advantages of such a reciprocal relation would have become so manifest that not a vestige of our system of custom-houses and tolls levied upon commerce would remain as witnesses of a system which had nothing to commend it, and had its origin in the strained relations which obtained between England and the United States.

As a step in the right direction, during the last days of the Forty-ninth Congress, I introduced a bill which provided for securing full, complete and unrestricted trade and commerce between the sixty millions of people of the United States and the five millions of Canadians, who are not only our kinsmen, but are our nearest neighbors—in fact, to all intents and purposes, of our very household. The bill was somewhat crude, but presents clearly the highway to the object to be attained.

It is suggested that there is some doubt as to how this proposition would be received by the American people—I speak of the citizens of the United States. First, it is not a party question. It has been received with general favor by the leading journals in all parts of the land. It is one that rises above the dead level of mere partisan expediency, and appeals to a higher motive and nobler ambition. It is a question of public policy as affecting all the people of both sections, and will so be viewed by our people. It involves, of course, a revision of the tariff, and this may suggest a party aspect, and the proposition may encounter opposition from those who are reaping large benefits from having the industries in which they are engaged specially and extravagantly protected, and on the idea that a commercial union might militate against their prosperity. But, fortunately, it involves the abandonment of neither free-trade nor protection theories. But whether it be made a party question or not, the party lines cannot be drawn

closely when the question is presented for action. There are times in the United States even when party feeling runs high—when the whippers-in detailed for the service are incapable of either muzzling their partisans or absolutely controlling their votes. I have every reason to believe that the policy adopted by our government in the matter of establishing reciprocity with Canada will appeal to the independence of our law-makers, and that caucuses, which have especial reference to mere party advantage, will not be allowed to control the action of Congress adversely.

In discussing this question we will of course bear in mind the physical conditions with which we have to treat. The territory of Canada is interlocked with our own. The rivers and lakes cross the boundary lines and are our common highways of traffic and trade. Their public highways are ours. The relation therefore of our territory to theirs, the location of our rivers, the facilities for conducting exchanges, all suggest and protest in favor of unhampered reciprocal trade. The resources of Canada, in that which constitutes material wealth, her supply of materials needed in the various avocations which employ our people, are boundless. On the other hand, we have infinite variety and exhaustless supply of things largely indispensable to the comfort and enjoyment of our Canadian neighbors. All these suggest the advantages to be derived from free commercial intercourse. We are not dealing with a people across the ocean, but our neighbors and kinsmen.

It is not my purpose to read statistics. They are dry, and unless studied with care are apt to mislead. While figures do not lie they may be made to prevaricate most abominably. It is chiefly with the philosophy of the situation I purpose to deal to-night.

Now, proceeding from the stand-point which views the prospect and measures it wholly by dollars and cents, I propose to canvass the situation. And first, in that behalf,

who are the parties to the controversy? with whose interests are we dealing? Leaving out the question of an argument in regard to the revenue for the support of the government, I insist that unless it be the mission of both governments to sacrifice the interests of the many for the aggrandizement of the few, the present system which compels our Canadian neighbors to pay fifty millions of dollars a year for the privilege of supplying to the citizens of the United States articles indispensable to their comfort and prosperity, and which compels the citizens of the United States to pay a like sum into the public treasury of Canada for the privilege of doing like service for Canadians living across an imaginary line, is absolutely defenseless and wholly without excuse. It is not enough to show, if it is a fact, that certain lines of industry prosper under such a system. It must appear that on the whole it promotes the general good. In other words, the prosperity resulting from any governmental system must be of that character in which all our citizens can share. If defensible at all, it is solely from a basis of needed revenue.

To illustrate the character of the trade between the United States and Canada, I have procured a statement of the imports from Canada and the exports to the Dominion from the year 1850, to and including the year 1878, covering the period of partial reciprocity as established in 1854, and which terminated in 1866. During that period Canada, of her products, sold to the United States, in round numbers, \$700,000,000 worth, the larger per cent. of which consisted of lumber or timber. During the same period we exported to Canada \$848,000,000 worth of our stock in trade. I should be glad to learn how either Canadian or Yankee prospered by reason of the immense tax levied upon the goods so exported or imported. I should be glad to learn just how any blessing that attached to paying one-third of the value of the goods so exchanged inured to the benefit

of any considerable number of our people. The men who used these goods, both in this country and Canada, paid a price largely in excess of their value, and only because they were produced across an imaginary line drawn from East to West, and which marks the Northern frontier of the United States and the Southern frontier of Canada. Certainly the philosophy of the doctrine of protection has no application here.

I am a protectionist. To that system we are in large measure indebted for our marvelous development in the industrial arts. One article in my political confession of faith declares in favor of protecting infant industries, in order that they may become strong enough to stand alone and be independent in the great field of competition; but that article refers, mark you, to infant industries, and not to such as are full-grown and wear overcoats and No. 10 boots, and are capable of maintaining themselves against all competitors, certainly upon this side of the water. To protect industries without reference to the conditions which invoke protection would be to create monopolies, the overweening influence of which would be, nay is, more dangerous to liberty than the crown of a queen.

Our countrymen would merit contempt if they sought protection against competition with Canada, and with all due respect for the worthy gentlemen who met at Toronto to speak for the manufacturers of Canada, I have as little sympathy with the Canadian who insists that his countrymen lack the ability, or enterprise, or resources, to enable them to hold their own against competition in the United States in any field of industrial effort. In my judgment, protection to the industries of the United States against Canada means no more and no less than taking the money out of the pocket of one citizen and putting it into the pocket of another, the latter belonging to the protected and favored class. As stated in my opening remarks, protection,

as I understand it, relates to and deals with unequal conditions, and has no other just mission than to equalize them. It certainly is not intended to make hard the lot of the many that we may rejoice in the prosperity of the few. To protect one class of citizens against competition with another class, in any field of effort where the conditions are the same, is wholly defenseless. In my judgment, nothing is easier than to defend the system of protection in the United States as against competition with the old world. It certainly would be difficult to successfully defend a similar system as between the Eastern and Western sections or the Northern and Southern sections of the United States; and equally defenseless to protect against competition with Canada and for a like reason.

I refer to this matter at this time because my position on the question of a commercial union is in perfect harmony with my convictions upon the subject of protection, being a protectionist of a somewhat ultra school. I insist, and it is too clear to need argument, that there is as little reason, as an abstract proposition, in restricting or in any wise hampering the trade between the citizens of the United States and the citizens of Canada as there would be in imposing the same conditions and burthens upon the trade between the inhabitants of Ohio and those of Illinois and Iowa, and for like and obvious reasons. I have already suggested that a tariff, if levied for protection, relates solely to unequal conditions which it seeks to equalize. But if it be true that prosperity comes simply through a protective tariff, without reference to conditions, and we become rich and prosperous by levying duties upon all we buy if produced elsewhere, and are by the same token fenced out of every market to which we should sell, by a like system of duties, it is impossible to see why each State in this Union may not speedily become rich and prosperous by simply erecting a tariff fence as between itself and

the other States of the Union. It is true the Constitution forbids this, but I am discussing the abstract proposition. It is perfectly clear that if it is justifiable in the case of Canada, as a measure which insures prosperity to the people adopting it, it is equally clear that each State might become prosperous by adopting the same system as against the other States, and, since prosperity is one of the highroads to happiness, we have found out how each State and all the citizens thereof may become prosperous and happy by taxing themselves and recognizing the right of their neighbors to tax them also, and thus, what according to my understanding, has been esteemed a burden, becomes at once a help and support. Thus Quebec and Ontario and the other provinces can speedily become prosperous. It is what Mr. Wiman described as a process of taxing oneself rich.

Unless it can be shown that there is something in the situation and condition of Canada which makes the case exceptional, and takes it out of the comparison I have instituted, the system we have pursued as against our neighbors and they against us, is as defenseless as it would be for Pennsylvania to seek the prosperity of all her people by a tariff system as against Illinois—Illinois being more largely an agricultural State than Pennsylvania; or, to put the case more strongly, as defenseless as it would be for Illinois to establish a tariff for the benefit of all her citizens as against Connecticut and Massachusetts, the latter being manufacturing States while the former is a great agricultural State. Every careful student will observe that the law of compensation operates constantly, that trade and commerce seek natural channels, that manufactures will ultimately, other things being equal, locate nearest the base of supplies, since it involves an absurdity to ship material a thousand miles to be manufactured and then reship the finished product over the same line to find a market.

will thus be seen that the markets of the country are near the source of supplies for all practical purposes. Now, what are the objections presented so far as the citizens of the United States are concerned? I hear of none except as they relate purely and solely to some other interest. It is proper to call attention to the fact that one of the leading statesmen of the day, one who has filled possibly a larger place in the public view than almost any other man of our day—I allude to James G. Blaine—has advocated, and most ably, a commercial union between the United States and the South American States. His proposition has met with general favor, nor has it been treated as a party question. If great advantages are to be derived from such a union, how much greater and more important are the advantages to be gained from an intimate trade relation with those immediately upon our border, to whom we are allied by ties stronger than those which relate merely to commerce, and with whom our trade, although they number but five millions, is more than the trade with the forty millions lying south of us and with whom the commercial union is proposed. I submit a statement which indicates how much more valuable to the United States as a market Canada is than all the realms lying south of the Rio Grande, including Mexico and the South American States.

During the year 1885 the United States sold to all the Central and South American States but \$27,000,000 in round numbers, and to all countries south of the Rio Grande, in the aggregate \$64,000,000. To the 45,000,000 of people in the South we sold \$64,000,000, while to the 5,000,000 of Canadians we sold over \$50,000,000.

If our hampered and restricted trade with 5,000,000 Canadians is over \$50,000,000, what will be the magnitude of our commerce in that direction when the blockade is removed, and when our neighbors shall number 25,000,000 of people?

Do American manufacturers fear competition? Certainly not. Do they and our merchants desire the Canadian market with the great possibilities that open up before them in that direction? Certainly they do. Does the American farmer fear competition with the Canadian farmer? It is simply impossible. There could be no conflict of interest. On the contrary, experience abundantly attests that with every avenue of trade and commerce between the sources of supply in the United States and the markets of Canada, and between every source of supply in Canada and markets of the United States opened up, and uninterrupted, a new impetus would be given to every branch of trade and industry, and a new era of prosperity for both nations would dawn upon us. In this connection it may be well to note that we are accustomed to explain to the agriculturists, and those interested with them in tilling the soil, that their prosperity has been secured by the protective system in that it furnished markets for their grain and other produce; and that is in large measure true; but if we pick up the statistics which disclose the range of prices of farm products during the last sixty years, we will find that whatever may have happened to other branches of industry, the prices which farmers have received for their products have not substantially advanced, and to show that I am not mistaken in this behalf I read a list of the prices obtained at various times during that period of sixty years.

I quote New York prices taken from Trade Reports: Take an article of flour. In 1825 the price of flour in New York ranged from \$3.50 to \$4.25 a barrel. At the close of the next five years, that is in 1830, from \$4.75 to \$6 a barrel. In 1835, from \$5.37 to \$7.87; and in 1840, from \$4.62 to \$6.50; and in 1845, from \$4.31 to \$7; in 1850, from \$4.93 to \$6.25; in 1860, from \$4.25 to \$5.25; in 1870, from \$4.50 to \$6.05; in 1880, from \$3.75 to \$5.75; and in 1885, from \$2.90 to \$3.70; and in 1886, from \$2.65 to \$3.50.

Turning to mackerel, which seems to be in point, the price in 1825 was from \$5 to \$5.75 per barrel. In 1835, it was from \$6 to \$8.25; in 1845, from \$11.50 to \$14; in 1855, from \$18 to \$22; in 1865, from \$15 to \$25; in 1875, from \$7 to \$24; and in 1885, from \$14 to \$24; and in 1886, from \$15 to \$29.

So it is difficult to see how, compared to the farming industry, the fishing industry has suffered. The range of prices has been decidedly in favor of the fisherman. Take the subject of beef, mess beef, by the barrel. The range of prices has been about the same. In 1825, from \$8 to \$10; in 1835, from \$8 to \$13.50. In 1845 it was lower—from \$5.50 to \$9.75; in 1855, from \$8.25 to \$14; in 1865, which was during the war, it ranged from \$9 to \$14; in 1875, from \$8 to \$10; in 1885, from \$10 to \$16; and in 1886, from \$5 to \$12. The range in the price of hams has been about the same.

Corn has ranged about the same for the last sixty years. All these figures relate to the market in New York. The great commercial channels opened up—I mean the railroads and canals—have tended to equalize prices, so that it is no longer necessary to burn corn in the great West.

The range of prices in wheat has not been more favorable to the farmer. The price ranging from 75 cents to \$1.06 in 1825; from 83 to 95½ cents in 1886.

Mess pork ranged from \$12 to \$14.75 in 1825; to from \$9 to \$14.50 in 1885, and \$10 to \$12.50 in 1886.

In the meantime, farmers and producers generally of the things upon which we live have had to pay largely increased prices for wages. Of course, it must be remembered that the facilities for farming have greatly increased, so that one man can do the work of two or three. Therefore, relatively, wages have not been greatly increased.

It must not be forgotten that there are affecting the

farmer certain conditions which no system of production can control—the rain and the sunshine. His crops depend upon the earlier and the latter rains, nor can any system of law increase the yield of his ground in the presence of a drouth or a superabundance of rain; but the products of the factory can be controlled, the output limited and the prices fixed. His competitors for the European market are not in Canada, but in India and Russia. Canada only produced the past year about seven per cent. of the wheat grown in this country. There are special interests which, of course, will be affected. That the fishing interest will be seriously crippled, I do not believe, nor can I agree that that nursery of seamen and school which supplies the army or the militia of the sea will suffer by reason of fair competition between the Canadians and the men of New England who go down to the sea to catch fish. If with similar conditions and fair competition we cannot hold our own on sea and land the trouble must be found in conditions and fair competition; if we cannot hold our own on sea and land the trouble must be found in conditions which are not to be righted by the levying of a tax which increases the price of every codfish ball and every mackere, which is placed upon the table for food. So far as the timber interest is concerned it has no proper place in our system of protection, the object of which is to build up industries, but unfortunately for the timber industry in this country the more it is protected, the more it is cherished, the more speedily it dies, and we are and have been taxing ourselves upon every shingle we use and every beam that we require to construct a dwelling, not to make strong an industry that will flourish and grow and furnish a more ample yield, but simply to pay a bonus to certain individuals who have prospered beyond measure, and without any corresponding benefit to the great mass of the people of this country upon whom the tribute was levied.

The Canadian forests are limitless. Their timber is rotting and going to waste, while the citizens of the United States are paying enormous prices for a supply to construct houses and make shingles to cover their heads, and thousands of merchants are idle for want of the material—lumber—to enable them to prosecute their calling. Idle men on both sides of the line are the direct and necessary result of our absurd system. It is not only absurd, but an outrage upon our people, when one or two industries are permitted, nay authorized, for their own benefit, to tax every other vocation, trade and calling in this country, and thus impose needless burthens. The time has come when both burdens and blessings should be more equitably distributed, and what is proposed here is a step in the right direction.

Now, with your indulgence, I will consider for a moment the objections raised by our friends across the line to the consummation of full and complete reciprocity. They are, first, that such a system would be destructive to the manufacturing interests of Canada; second, that it would be treason against the mother country; that it is, in fact, the essence of disloyalty, and that it means in its last analysis annexation to and absorption by the United States. Lastly, it is urged that the mercantile interests of Canada would suffer, and that drummers from New York and Boston would absolutely destroy the trade of Montreal, Quebec, Toronto, Hamilton and the leading cities of the Dominion; that the revenues of Canada would be lost.

I notice, Mr. Chairman, that a leading journal of Toronto suggests that you and I were born twenty-five years too late for all purposes of reciprocity and commercial union between Canada and the United States, and in the same article it is suggested that a quarter of a century ago this matter might have been favorably considered, but now it cannot be. And attention is called in that connec-

tion to the fact that there must be borne in mind "the expenditure of the past twenty years in railroad construction, in acquiring territory, and in various ways having in view inter-provincial trade and the development of Canadian national sentiment through closer inter-provincial commercial relations, the purpose being to do away with unnatural barriers, and allow each province to cultivate the trade adjacent to it. The argument submitted by the learned editor defeats itself. The only purpose of improving the railroad system of either country, and improving the water-ways, is to enable the producers to reach the markets of the world. If they serve any other proper purpose it is difficult to understand what it is. It is also suggested as a part of the criticism of the policy of reciprocity that the system and efforts before referred to, of improved agencies for commercial intercourse, were made to do away with the unnatural barriers between the provinces, and to cultivate the trade adjacent to them. This is pertinent and suggests that all barriers that block the natural highways of trade and commerce should be removed. It suggests also that it is natural and proper to cultivate the trade which is at hand rather than seek a market in the distance when a better one is near our own doors. That is precisely the thing for which patriots on both sides of the line, in Canada and America, are struggling, and with a view to securing advantages to all who have a right to share in the prosperity which grows out of unselfish patriotism and attaches to proper individual effort.

The point made in the same article, that drummers from New York and Boston would destroy the mercantile business of Canada, is hardly worth considering. The argument has been met and answered a hundred times, and the experience of everyday life absolutely shows how fallacious it is. If the objections mentioned were well taken, it must follow that there would not be a healthful mercantile busi-

ness carried on in any of the cities of the great West. Certainly New York and Boston would have no advantages over Canadian cities that they do not have over the towns and cities of the great West. To suggest that the rival competition of New York and Boston would destroy the mercantile interests of Canada would be to assert that the merchants of Canada and Canadian enterprise belong to a former century, and to a people who do not possess the aggressive energy and merit to compete with all comers in an even field of business venture.

It will be remembered, in this same connection, that there was at one time, among men representing large Eastern interests, much opposition to the enlargement of the facilities for transportation along the line of our Northern frontier, whether by our Canadian friends or our own people; it being urged that it would open up a line of travel, a commercial highway if you please, which would cripple the middle and Southern lines of trade and commerce. Time has demonstrated how thoroughly untenable the position was. Men only have rightly to consider the elements that enter into a solution of these various problems to observe that the law of compensation operates everywhere.

It is urged by certain honorable gentlemen in Canada, and by some in this country, as an objection to the measure, that the move in the direction of commercial union seeks ultimately, and has, in fact, for its prime object, the annexation of Canada to the United States. Do gentlemen believe that annexation would follow commercial union? If so, upon what do they base their conclusion? Does Canadian prosperity involve annexation to the United States? Does Canadian prosperity involve disloyalty to the British crown? If so, why? Is there anything in the relation of Canada to the mother country which suggests that prosperity can only come to Canadians by severing their connection with the English government? It would seem

that gentlemen who insist that prosperity means annexation must conclude that annexation is indispensable to Canadian prosperity and happiness. I do not agree with them. Canadians are satisfied with their form of government. There is no desire on this side to change it, nor yet to have them adopt any phase of our own. We can work out our destinies side by side. That we must and will have one common destiny in many respects I have no doubt. We are one people to all intents and purposes, so far as Christian civilization and the end it seeks is concerned; and, so far as the things to be attained by the growth and extension, as that civilization require a common purpose and a common effort, we will, whatever the respective form of government under which we live, be one people. Commercial union is in no wise inseparable from annexation. One does not suggest the other, unless the fact that such a union banishes all possibility of attrition between the two countries, and puts the seal to a bond of perpetual peace between them, is evidence of a desire for annexation.

I may stop here to call the attention of the honorable members of this Club to a few facts bearing upon the history of Canada and her relations to Great Britain. I have already alluded to it. Gentlemen are, of course, aware that the tie which binds us to Canada has little relation to commerce—the tie that binds ourselves and Canada to Great Britain—I speak not now of political relations, but those that grow out of kinship, similar language and similar religion—have little relationship to commercial intercourse. If Canada finds no closer tie between her people and those from whom they are descended than that which is born of trade and commerce, it is a matter of little consequence how soon those ties are severed. The history of Canada and of the United States, so far as England is concerned, is the same. The record of the history of Canada during the last half century discloses the fact that her com-

plaints against the mother country have been similar in character to those which compelled the colonies to petition for redress of grievances. Canada complained of the navigation laws so far as they appertained to her. They were modified or absolutely changed. She insisted that it was her right to regulate her internal policy by representatives chosen by the people who were to be affected by the laws. That too was conceded. She demanded also that she should collect and disburse her own revenue, according to her own idea of correct internal policy. That too was conceded. She asked in effect that she should be sovereign, within her borders, touching all matters pertaining to her civil administration. That too was conceded, and these just concessions have above all else to-day—barring the mere matter of kinship and the ties of common ancestry, of a common religion if you please, and those which grow out of similar institutions, and as I believe a common destiny—preserved among Canadians the spirit of perfect loyalty toward Great Britain.

The fear that Canada will be absorbed by the United States, or that she will lose her independence and dignity as a sovereign nation, strikes me as absurd. Whether she shall stand among the nations of the earth, great, rich and independent, will turn upon the character of her people and the manner in which she utilizes her vast resources. Her mineral resources invite the most healthful character of immigration. Her vast forests are only waiting for hardy pioneers and adventurous spirits to prosecute the various avocations which depend upon a supply of timber. It is so with reference to her various resources.

I observe also that it is suggested by some writers for the Canadian press that such an arrangement as is contemplated would be in the nature of an alliance offensive and defensive with the United States as against Great Britain. This is so far from the fact that it must be regarded as in

the nature of an appeal to unenlightened patriotic sentiment rather than to the intelligent judgment of our Canadian friends.

It is not for the mere advantage which is to be counted in dollars and cents that, as an American citizen, I urge full reciprocity with Canada. It is to secure, not a bond of political union, but nevertheless a bond of union which will keep the English-speaking race now and for all time one people in fulfilling the mission of the highest and best form of civilization the world has known.

The resolution adopted by the gentlemen who met in Toronto, asserts "That unrestricted reciprocity in manufactured goods would be a serious blow at the commercial integrity of the Dominion and would result disastrously to their manufacturing and farming industries and other financial and commercial interests. The farmers, at least, had spoken for themselves, and their resolution was certainly the outgrowth of intelligent investigation and a just appreciation of what was essential to create prosperous conditions. I doubt if the honorable gentlemen in the resolution represent the sentiments of any very large portion of the people of Canada who, in the last analysis, are to bear the burthens of what is dubbed the N. P., or national policy of protection.

Did it ever occur to our manufacturing friends in Toronto that the resources at their command, which are almost illimitable, must attract to their borders the active energy which, after all, makes a country great and prosperous? That such would be the case all history abundantly attests. Possibly, Mr. Chairman, if reciprocity had obtained twenty-five years ago, we would not have been honored by your presence and masterly enterprise in New York. In fact, this Club might not have been in existence. The energy which you have put forth here would have found such profitable employment on the other side of the line that you

would not have come among us, but your friendship for us, nor ours for you, would have been a whit lessened by the fact of the prosperity which waited upon each country.

Whatever may be said to the contrary, I take it from the discussions in the English Parliament that England will not feel greatly disturbed over a commercial union between Canada and the United States. Able discussions in that body as to the effect of protective tariffs indicate that it is the opinion of English statesmen that whatever advantage may accrue to the protected country, if any, no disadvantage will result to England. Such is the statement made by Mr. Chamberlain, and his statement is supported by figures, cited in his speech of August 12, 1881, in reply to an address from the throne, which urged retaliatory measures as against nations exacting high duties on goods imported from England. I have here the speech of Mr. Chamberlain, and have been interested in observing how thoroughly his conclusions are sustained by the statistics he cites. I regret that I have not time to read portions of it.

I think careful investigation will disclose that any industry which should be protected in Canada as against European competition would require an equal protection in the United States, and that protective system which in its operation would be of benefit to Canada would be equally beneficial to the United States, and *vice versa*. In large part, of course, duties would be levied with reference to the revenue to be derived, the protection in large part being merely incidental.

It is suggested by certain gentlemen, and I speak of this because I am addressing Canadians, that the proper thing would be an arrangement of reciprocity between England and Canada in which the former should discriminate against the farm produce of other countries. That would be a very remarkable proceeding—to add to the price of the food on every laborer's table in England in

order to obtain a market for the output of British factories. Such a scheme would not be defensible for one moment. Nor would England be content to tax the bread and potatoes and meat of her workmen to attain the possible advantage of a new market in which to sell the products of her shops.

So far as the agricultural interests of this country and Canada are concerned it must be conceded that they are not as able to secure a hearing as the manufacturers, the merchants and financiers, who are more immediately connected with the active business of trade and commerce. The cities are centres of political influence, and also the centres of trade and financial ventures, and hence the interest in competition with agriculture not only have more ready access to the public ear, but the sympathies of those who have the most ample means to control the current of public thought are lodged in the quarter which promises most remuneration.

I would call the attention of the speakers at the manufacturers' convention at Toronto, and the editors who echo the sentiments expressed, that the prosperity they would secure to Canada as a result of defeating all reciprocity that is not onesided, is of a character that will not be shared in generally by the mass of people on either side of the line. The time has come when the burthens and blessings incident to national development and healthful growth must be shared equally by all as nearly as may be, and I think we may rejoice in the fact that the farmers, artisans and producers generally of Canada and the United States will no longer permit those who alone profit by a protective system which does not deal with and correct unequal conditions, without rebuke to assume to represent and speak for all who have a right to be heard on the question. It is impossible to see how any interest of Canada or the United States could suffer by reason of an active, healthful trade be-

tween the two nations. It is equally difficult to see how a growing tide swelling every artery and vein of commerce, reaching from every part of Canada to the markets of the United States and from every part of the producing sections of the United States to Canada to meet the demands of the people, could injure any business interest that is fit to survive. The suggestion, to my mind at least, is absurd, and I greatly doubt if it has its origin in a patriotic love of country. There is about it a savory, if not a positive suggestion of selfish interest to be served by securing profits, escaping burdens imposed upon others as a means to secure those profits.

I note what is said touching the destructive influence in international free commerce upon the fisheries and some other industries. It is asserted with great force, and seemingly the assertion is sustained by statistics, that free fisheries for instance mean the destruction absolutely of the American fishing interest. In reply to that I have to say that if on equal terms the American fisherman is unable to compete with the fisherman of Canada it does not prove the former inferior in any respect, or that he lacks the capacity to accomplish what, under the same circumstances, the Canadian can accomplish, but it does prove that there is something wrong in our policy, in some part of our governmental machinery, that any business is so oppressed that with even chances in the arena of competition Yankees are driven from the field hopeless and crushed; and the remedy must be sought otherwise than by driving such competition from our midst by oppressive legislation. If we feel we are unequal to the task of holding our own in the field of open, free and equal competition, we had better improve our stock. I am for America and American institutions and interests first, last and all the time; but that question is not involved here. It is only of doing that which shall build up every American interest that is worth cher-

ishing, and we will not build up one at the expense of another, since by such means our industrial growth would be neither healthful or permanent.

If any industry of the United States carried on within our own territory or along our coast cannot survive competition with that of our immediate neighbors divided from us only by an imaginary line, the reason for such failure upon our part must be sought in some unwise feature of governmental policy, which hampers our citizens in their efforts, and not in the mere matter of superior merit on the part of our competitors to conduct the industry or enterprise. Until I am satisfied of my error, for one I am unwilling to admit that we are not equal for the emergency of holding our own with any nation in the world that competes with us under circumstances substantially the same, and I would be ashamed of the Canadian who would not make the like assertion concerning his countrymen.

I have already commented upon the proposition that it is the mission of the government on this earth to provide such artificial conditions that it shall be as profitable to farm thin, impoverished soil in New England as it is to cultivate the rich valleys of the Mohawk or the Scioto and the Wabash. I have only to say that when the government essays to do that I am earnestly in favor of revolution. We are not wanting in rich soil in this country sufficient to feed the world, and that part of the country which is not fit for profitable cultivation can be abandoned, enriched by private enterprise, or used for other purposes than farming. Our transportation facilities are sufficient to feed the localities where the manufacturing industries are located. The law of compensation applies, and if New England finds it not profitable to farm, she still finds it profitable to engage in manufactures of various kinds, and her people, if not the producers of corn and wheat, are nevertheless producers of plows, hoes, trace-chains, and thousands of other necessary

articles, and the genius of her sons has made them very rich; in fact, they are the bankers of the United States, and Eastern thrift has been so great that their capitalists hold mortgages on a large part of the farms in the West. I trust, if the time has not come, it is not far off when the government will be engaged in some other mission than that of multiplying the blessings of the few by an inequitable distribution of public burthens.

This measure should be considered by every board of trade, every chamber of commerce, every agricultural association, every society composed of manufacturers and producers generally. Congress has and will have no official judgment about it. The boards and associations I have mentioned must do the legislating—Congress is only a sounding board, a cave of echoes, an assemblage of unpatented graphophones repeating what is talked into them by the people.

They are engaged for the most part in formulating into law the popular will, and I by no means use the term popular will as synonymous with intelligent public judgment. As individuals, Congressmen have intelligent convictions, are capable, conscientious men; but as Congressmen they do not attempt to form or direct the public mind. They respond to your will. It is their business to agree with you, for by this they live, and they will not consciously commit political suicide.

It follows that you will determine for yourselves and the country whether the immense volume of our trade shall be damned up and rolled back upon ourselves, and whether a system which smacks of an earlier period and a ruder and less advanced civilization, will continue to dwarf our enterprise and retard our development.